



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/336,706	06/21/1999	SUMIYO OKADA	21.1924/JRB	7969
21171	7590	09/14/2006	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			PRIETO, BEATRIZ	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/336,706	Applicant(s) OKADA ET AL.	
	Examiner Prieto Beatriz	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 13-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-15 and 18-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 16, 17 and 26-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 June 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |



DETAILED ACTION

1. Claimed subject matter has been pointed out on Appeal Brief filed 3/21/05 as “*well-known*” by applicant. Thereby, admission(s) by applicant constitute prior art against the claims (see MPEP §2129) reducing the issues of that may be presented to the Board of Appeals.

2. Appellant’s *well-known in the art statement* (p. 8 of Brief filed 3/21/05) was taken to be admitted prior art as well as the teachings set forth by the RFC 1459.

Specifically, regarding the claim (1) clause “each chat network has one or more servers”, lacking written disclosure in the specification of instant invention, Appellant has indicated on the record (p. 8 of Brief filed 3/21/05), that this feature is “*implicit in the specification*” of the invention in view of RFC 1459 reference *mentioned* (not incorporated by reference therein) in the invention’s related art section on page 1 of the invention’s disclosure. Thereby, previously raised rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph of claims 1, 26, 27 and 34 was withdrawn and applicant’s *well-known in the art statement* (p. 8 of Brief filed 3/21/05) was taken to be admitted prior art as well as the teachings set forth by the RFC 1459.

3. Appellant’s *well-known in the art statement* (p. 4-5 of Brief filed 3/21/05) was taken to be admitted prior art as well as the teachings set forth by the “TOURBUS”

Specifically, it was taken that in a chat network (IRC) a chat client can connect to a chat channel and participate in a live conversation with one or more people, wherein anyone can connect to the same channel and read messages sent by one participant, by having an chat client (IRC) client software connect to an IRC server a remote host that provides chat service, based on the teaching of this reference.

4. Appellant’s *well-known in the art statement* (p. 8 of Brief filed 3/21/05) was taken to be admitted prior art as well as the teachings set forth by the “Chatting on the Net”.

Specifically, regarding claim (26 and 27) clause “here different channels do not share messages”, lacking written disclosure in the specification of instant invention. Appellant has indicated on the record (p. 10 of Brief filed 3/21/05), that claims 26 and 27 recite “*well-known*” features and “*inherent of IRC/chat networks*”. Applicant states that “*it is well-known at the time of the invention that chat networks do not share, for example, channels or messages*”. Applicant also indicated that *it is well-known* at the time of the invention that “*chat messages ate not exchanged between the two chat networks*”. Applicant has stated that the reference “Chatting on the Net” (reference made of record not relied on) discloses that

they are many chat networks, each is a separate entity unto itself. One network does not cooperate with another network. The networks do not share common servers. Thereby, rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph of claims 26-27 is withdrawn and applicant's *well-known in the art statement* was taken to be admitted prior art as well as the teachings set forth by the RFC 1459 and Chatting on the Net references.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-2, 31 and 36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Amendment adding limitation *requesting and obtaining cooperation from the two chat networks for display of messages of the two chat networks*, as filed 10/03/05 does not seem to be described in the specification as originally filed.

The invention's disclosure describes a process for displaying the transmission and receipt of messages by a plurality of channels using the chat system (30), displayed using the message display means (30) on the user's terminal, concurrently. Specifically, when the message display means is started the cooperation request transmitting means sends a *cooperation request*, e.g. a command to the chat system, when determined by the request receiving means of the chat system determines that it is a cooperation request from the message display means, a *path* for automatically transmitting the contents of the message transmitted and/or received by the chat system is extended between the chat system and the message display, thereafter messages received and transmitted are notified to the message display means (specs page 9, lines 5-34). The cooperation request transmitting means (21) transmits and/or receives the setting information required for operating the chat system (30) and message display means (20) at the same time (see specs page 7, lines 89-23).

In another embodiment of the invention, according to the invention's disclosure, it is a precondition that all the messages transmitted and/or received are notified to the message display while still being able to identify the cooperated IRC network and the channel. This is achieved by requesting to

users to designate the IRC network and the channel by the cooperation request transmitting means which *displays an image urging users* to designate the cooperated IRC network name and the channel name, this obtained information is registered, namely the IRC network name and the channel name, thereafter, the message received means judges when the message is received, IRC network and channel to which the message is transmitted and notifies the message via the message notifying means for those considered as the cooperation object (see specs page 17, lines 5-29 and Figs. 3-4).

Hence, the invention's disclosure does not seem to provide a written description for (i) a cooperation requested and *obtained from the two IRC networks*. The invention's disclosure does not seem to provide a written description for (ii) *requesting and obtaining cooperation from the two chat networks for display of messages of the two chat networks to automatically extend a display path for the messages*. The invention's disclosure does not seem to provide a written description for (iii) message acquiring means of the user terminal for acquiring messages transmitted and received to/from each of the plurality of chat networks requested by the cooperation request transmitting means.

[AS BEST UNDERSTOOD] the above described embodiment of the invention seems to describe where users are presented with an image by the chat system which urges the user to designate the IRC network name and the channel name, this obtained information is registered, thereafter, the message received from the designated IRC network and channel are notified to the display means.

Regarding new claim 36, namely, claim clause, "to automatically extend a display path for messages". The description of instant invention is a dictionary for the claims and should provide clear support or antecedent basis for all terms used in the claims. See 37 CFR 1.75, MPEP § 608.01(i), § 608.01(o), and § 1302.01. The claim or claims must conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification and the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description (See § 37 CFR 1.75 d(1)). The specification has been reviewed with respect to the claimed term "display path" to ensure an adequate meaning in light of the specification is applied. Although the claimed term "display path" seems to lack antecedent basis in the specification, a path seems to relate to displaying the transmission and receipt of messages by a plurality of channels between the chat system and the message display means concurrently, by transmitting the contents of the message transmitted and/or received by the chat system to the display, concurrently. Specifically, when the display means is started, the cooperation display means (20) is started (shown as step S2101 of Fig. 3 illustrating cooperation request transmitting means process) to send (step S2101 of fig. 3) a command ("report message") is sent to the chat system, the process ends (step S2102 of Fig. 3). The request receiving means process of Fig. 4, illustrates, that when the receiving means (31) determines that it is the

cooperation request (step S3101 of Fig. 4), e.g. command report-message, the cooperation flag of setting information is validated (step S3102). Hence, a path for automatically transmitting the contents of the message transmitted and/or received by the chat system (30) is extended between the chat system and message display means (20) (see page 9, lines 5, line 5-34). The cooperation request transmitting means (21) transmits and/or received the setting information required for operating the chat system (30) and message display means (20) at the same time (specs page 7, lines 9-12)

Broadest reasonable interpretation will be applied in accordance with the invention's disclosure discussed above. Namely, claim limitation "automatically extend a display path for the messages", as meaning automatically transmitting over a connection the contents of the message transmitted and/or received by the chat system to the display means for displaying the messages.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC 103

7. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action may be found in previous office action.

8. Claims 1-3, 16-17, 26-35 and new 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over REDPATH et. al. U.S. Patent No. 5,990,887 (referred to as Redpath hereafter) in view of Admitted prior art in further view of TANG et. al. (US 5,793,365) (Tang hereafter)

Regarding claim 1, Redpath teaches a method including a ("chat client") user's terminal (100 or 110 of Fig. 2) in a ("information exchange") system (8 of Fig. 1) (abstract) for transmitting and receiving messages (col 1/lines 15-20, and col 2/lines 20-26) through two ("chat networks") communication means to transmit and receive the messages by the terminal (col 3/lines 3-13 and Fig. 2), the system comprising:

designating, with the client, one of two chat network as an active chat network for receiving messages transmitted by the client, [as best understood], inputting by a client (100 of Fig. 2) an instruction (i.e. designating) to a chat network for a channel communication, e.g. a messages transmitted by a user terminal to a recipient (col 3/lines 3-13 and Fig. 2);

obtaining with the user terminal (100/110 of Fig. 2) the messages at least some of which are transmitted to or received from one of the chat networks and at least some of which are transmitted to or received from another of the chat networks (col 3/lines 3-32, Figs. 6A-C); and

displaying with the user's terminal the obtained messages transmitted to the two chat networks in ("first discrete display") an area independent of a message display area of each the two chat networks (602, 608, 616, 622 of Fig. 6A, col 3/lines 3-32 and col 4/line 37 to col 5/line 12);

wherein the chat client is configured transmit and receive the messages through one host server that provides chat communication service to chat clients (Redpath: col 2/lines 20-25, see Internet service provider (ISP), i.e. a server col 1/lines 15-27), where the chat communication service to chat clients is independent (Redpath: Fig. 6 illustrates an independent chat communication service to the chat client, in that the message (602) by chat client (600) received by chat clients (610) and (620), and the message (608) sent by same client (602) does not affect message (604) message sent by two chat client or vice-versa); however Redpath does not explicitly disclose that communication is concurrent in a period of time, not explicitly disclose that messages are obtained from a first chat network and some messages are obtained from another chat network.

It is has been admitted as prior art that chat networks each have one or more chat servers that provide independent chat communication service (p. 3 of brief). The IRC network has been defined as a logical network formed in units of service offered to user of the chat network system, and is *different* from a physical network by applicant's disclosure (specs p. 8, lines 6-31). Admitted well-known prior art reference RFC 1459 on Fig. 2 on p. 10, shows a chat client (1) communicating with other chat clients, e.g. chat client (4) and chat client (3) over two chat networks (i.e. units of service offered to user of the chat network system, different from a physical network) for example, units of service servers (A & B) and units of service servers (C & D) respectively. It is well-know in the art that in a an Internet chat environment, a chat client (1) communicates (i.e. receiving/transmitting messages) with chat client (3) over a first chat network having one or more servers (i.e. A & B) and may concurrently also communicate with another chat client (3) over a second chat network having one or more servers (i.e. C & D) (see RFC 1459 section 3.1 on p. 10-11).

Hence, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made given the suggestions of Redpath for representing a data processing system for implementing a chat environment having a plurality of network each having their own set of resources including a plurality of processors comprising servers, the teachings for implementing a chat system as set forth by RFC 1459 would be readily apparent and well-known. One would be motivated to combine the teachings of set forth by RFC 1459 with the teachings of Redpath because the teachings of the RFC reference set forth instructive teachings of "the *most widely used chat protocol*", as noted by applicant (p. 6 of Brief). One

would also be motivated to combine the above-mentioned teaches because RFC further suggest that TCP/IP is not the only protocol in which chat environments may operate, thereby, it would be readily apparent to one ordinary skilled that it can easily be implemented in the Redpath system which seems to operate on both TCP/IP and UDP. However the above-mentioned prior art does not explicitly teach added claim limitation as interpreted providing information requested through a display from the chat client for display of messages of at least one the chat network.

Tang teaches providing information requested through a display from a chat client for display of messages of at least one chat network. Tang teaches displaying from a chat client window displayed on Figure 9, requesting the user to provide information e.g. a chat room directory (34) which includes a list of different topics (42) on ongoing chat session being discussed by other users of the computer system supporting the user interface display called "gallery system", the chat room directory also allows the worker to scope the listed topics, for example, by organizational level, or geographical location. The topic "Sun stock" is associated with its chat room window 30, which includes text data 32 comprising the substance of the discussion. To enter a specific chat room 30 from the chat directory 34, the current worker selects a topic 42, and clicks on the join button 46 (column 10, lines 51-column 11, line 3). In this manner, Tang teaches providing information requested through a display from the chat client for display of messages of at least one the chat network

It would obvious to one of ordinary at the time the invention was made to include the teachings of Tang in the Redpath's system because in doing so this would allow the user to selected the scope of listed topics, e.g. by organizational level, or geographical location, view detailed information about each topic displayed in text area when a topic is selected, and sort the topics by topic title, participant names, number of participants, date of most recent update, or other criteria, as suggested by Tang.

Regarding claim 2, Redpath teach substantial features of the invention as claimed, teaching ("information exchange") system in which user terminals (12/30 of Fig. 1 or 110/100 of Fig. 2) are configured for connection to a plurality of network communication sessions ("chat networks") to transmit and receive messages through the plurality of chat networks (col 3/lines 3-13, 38-41 and 49), the user terminals having a ("message display") area (Fig. 3) for displaying messages transmitted (Fig. 6A, elements 602, 608, 616, 622) and received (Fig. 6A, elements

604, 606) to or from each of the plurality of chat networks (col 3/lines 14-32), the information exchange system comprising:

designation means (100 of Fig. 2) (“designating”) establishing a (“chat network”) network communication or session of the plurality of chat networks as an (“active chat network”) current network communication or session for receiving messages transmitted by a user terminal, (col 3/lines 3-13 and Fig. 2); and

message acquiring means (100 of Fig. 2) of the user terminal for acquiring messages transmitted to each the plurality of chat networks (col 3/lines 3-13 and col 4/lines 37 to col 5/line 12); where the messages transmitted are requested by means (420 of Fig. 2) of the user terminal for display on the sender and receiver(s) display means (Redpath: column 4/lines 37-59); and

message displaying means (100 of Fig. 2 and Figs. 3 and 6) of the user terminal for displaying the acquired messages in a (“discrete display”) area independent of a (“message display”) area of each of the plurality of chat networks (col 4/lines 37-col 5/line 12 and 3/lines 3-13); however Redpath does not explicitly teach that messages are obtained from a first chat network and some messages are obtained from another chat network.

It is has been admitted as prior art that chat networks each have one or more chat servers that provide independent chat communication service (p. 3 of brief) inherently over a period of time (p. 9 of brief). The IRC network has been defined as a logical network formed in units of service offered to user of the chat network system (30), and is *different* from a physical network by applicant’s disclosure (specs p. 8, lines 6-31). Admitted well-known prior art reference RFC 1459 on Fig. 2 on p. 10, shows a chat client (1) communicating with other chat clients, e.g. chat client (4) and chat client (3) over two chat networks (i.e. *units of service offered to user of the chat network system, different from a physical network*) for example, units of service servers (A & B) and units of service servers (C& D) respectively. It is well-know in the art that in a an Internet chat environment, a chat client (1) communicates (i.e. receiving/transmitting messages) with chat client (3) over a first chat network having one or more servers (i.e. A & B) and may concurrently also communicate with another chat client (3) over a second chat network having one or more servers (i.e. C & D) (see RFC 1459 section 3.1 on p. 10-11).

Hence, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made given the suggestions of Redpath for representing a data processing system for implementing a chat environment having a plurality of network each having their own set of resources including a plurality of processors comprising servers, the teachings for implementing a chat system as set forth by RFC 1459 would be readily apparent and well-known. One would be motivated to combine the teachings of set forth

by RFC 1459 with the teachings of Redpath because the teachings of the RFC reference set forth instructive teachings of “the *most widely used chat protocol*”, as noted by applicant (p. 6 of Brief). One would also be motivated to combine the above-mentioned teaches because RFC further suggest that TCP/IP is not the only protocol in which chat environments may operate, thereby, it would be readily apparent to one ordinary skilled that it can easily be implemented in the Redpath system which seems to operate on both TCP/IP and UDP.

Regarding claim 3, message transmission cooperating means (100/110 of Fig. 2) of the user terminal for transmitting a message when the messaged edited and displayed on a designated area independent from the other designated areas on the screen is identified for transmission by pressing the enter causing the displayed message displayed on a designated area to be transmitted to recipient on at least one of the plurality of network (col 4/lines 36-col 5/line 12).

Regarding claim 16, Redpath teaches displaying messages of both chat networks in independent areas (602, 608, 616, 622 of Fig. 6a, col 3/lines 3-32 and 4/line 37-col 5/line 12).

Regarding claim 17, (“discrete display”) area is separate from another display area that is dedicated to the (“active chat”) network communication (col 4/lines 37-col 5/line 12 and 3/lines 3-13 of Figs. 3 and 6).

Regarding claims 26-27, Applicant’s *well-known in the art statement* (p. 8 of Brief filed 3/21/05) was taken to be admitted prior art as well as the teachings set forth by the “Chatting on the Net”. Specifically, regarding claim (26 and 27) clause “here different channels do not share messages”, lacking written disclosure in the specification of instant invention. Applicant has indicated on the record (p. 10 of Brief filed 3/21/05), that claims 26 and 27 recite “*well-known*” features and “*inherent* of IRC/chat networks”. Applicant states that “*it is well-known at the time of the invention that chat networks do not share, for example, channels or messages*”. Applicant also indicated that *it is well-known* at the time of the invention that “*chat messages ate not exchanged between the two chat networks*”. Applicant has stated that the reference “Chatting on the Net” (reference made of record not relied on) discloses that they are many chat networks, each is a separate entity unto itself. One network does not cooperate with another network. The networks do not share common servers. Thereby, rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph of claims 26-27 is withdrawn and applicant’s *well-known in the art statement* was taken to be admitted prior art as well as the teachings set forth by the RFC 1459 and Chatting on the Net references.

Regarding claim 28, chat networks are different, where the messages are identified according to the logical network, i.e. service of the sender (Redpath: Fig. 6 illustrates different chat networks 602, 612 & 614).

Regarding claim 29, displaying on the client (600) obtained messages in a first discrete area, i.e. a window (Redpath: 600 of Fig. 6) is independent from the message display area (Redpath; 610 or 620 of Fig. 6) of the plurality of chat networks.

Regarding claim 30, this is the computer readable implementation associated with claim 1, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims 31, this claim is substantially the same as claim 1, thereby same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 32, this claim is substantially the same as claim 29, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 33, this claim comprises limitations and/or features recited on claim 1, in that the information exchange transmits/receiving messages sent concurrently over a period of time, i.e. "interspersedly transmitted", same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 34, inputting a selected instruction (i.e. designating) to a chat network for a channel communication to a chat recipient displayed in the discrete display area (Redpath: 616 on Fig. 6B, where the instruction is directed to at least one corresponding host server having an InetAddress and corresponding socket/port 5001).

Regarding claim 35, the storage medium storing the instructions executable on a computer to perform the method of claim 31 (Redpath: column 2, lines 58 to column 3, line 2)

Regarding claim 36, comprises limitations substantially the same as those discussed on claims 1, 2 and 31, same rationale of rejection is applicable. Further limitations include

requesting and obtaining cooperation from the two chat networks for display of messages of the two chat networks, i.e. providing information requested through a display from the chat client for display of messages of at least one the chat network. (Tang: column 10, line 51- to column 11, line 3) to automatically transmitting over a connection "path" the contents of the message transmitted or received by the chat system to the display means for displaying the messages, specifically, where messages received by the chat client are automatically displayed by all other participants (Redpath, Fig. 5, steps 500, 520, 530 column 4, lines 9-16, transmission over connection of Fig. 5),

where messages received by the chat client as the user inputs a message is displayed on the display means, thus the chat client automatically extends a connection "path" to the display (Redpath column 4, lines 50-53) and

where the messages transmitted are requested by means (420 of Fig. 2) of the user terminal for display on the sender and receiver(s) display means (Redpath: column 4/lines 37-59).

9. Claims 1-3, 16-17, and 26-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redpath in view of Admitted prior art (p. 6 of brief filed 3/21/05) reference (US 6,212,548) DeSimone et. al. (DeSimone hereafter)

Regarding claim 1, Regarding claim 1, Redpath teaches a method including a ("chat client") user's terminal (100 or 110 of Fig. 2) in a ("information exchange") system (8 of Fig. 1) (abstract) for transmitting and receiving messages (col 1/lines 15-20, and col 2/lines 20-26) through two ("chat networks") communication means to transmit and receive the messages by the terminal (col 3/lines 3-13 and Fig. 2), the system comprising:

designation means (100 of Fig. 2) designating at a chat network of the plurality of chat network as an active chat network for receiving messages transmitted by a user terminal (col 3/lines 3-13 and Fig. 2);

obtaining with the user terminal (100/110 of Fig. 2) the messages at least some of which are transmitted to or received from one of the chat networks and at least some of which are transmitted to or received from another of the chat networks (col 3/lines 3-32, Figs. 6A-C); and

displaying with the user's terminal the obtained messages transmitted to the two chat networks in ("first discrete display") an area independent of a message display area of each the

two chat networks (602, 608, 616, 622 of Fig. 6A, col 3/lines 3-32 and col 4/line 37 to col 5/line 12);

wherein the chat client is configured transmit and receive the messages through one host server that provides chat communication service to chat clients (Redpath: col 2/lines 20-25, see Internet service provider (ISP), i.e. a server col 1/lines 15-27), where the chat communication service to chat clients is independent (Redpath: Fig. 6 illustrates an independent chat communication service to the chat client, in that the message (602) by chat client (600) received by chat clients (610) and (620), and the message (608) sent by same client (602) does not affect message (604) message sent by two chat client or vice-versa); however Redpath does not explicitly say that communication is concurrent in a period of time, not explicitly say that messages are obtained from a first chat network and some messages are obtained from another chat network.

DeSimone teaches obtaining with the client, the messages which are transmitted to a first of the at least two chat networks having one or more server, and messages which are transmitted to a second of the at least two chat networks having one or more server (i.e. each client is associated with a *particular server*, which server is associated with a designated *client*, col 5/lines 3-11, designated as recipient by another col 13/lines 61-66), when a message is launched for initiating or joining a chat conversation, the launched message contains identification of the *intended recipients* (i.e. to which server is associated therewith), be used by network routers including *respective servers* to route the messages to the terminal(s) of the indicated addressees (col 15/lines 20-27), and other claim limitations;

DeSimone teaches in a chat environment displaying messages with a chat client (105s of Fig. 1) in an information exchange system (150 of Fig. 1) for transmitting and receiving the messages (col 1/lines 26-39);

the chat client transmitting and receiving the messages to and/or from at least two independent chat networks facilities that each have one or more chat servers that provide chat communication service to chat clients (col 1/lines 26-36, 48-59, and col 4/lines 4-18) where the chat communication is independent, e.g. mutually exclusive (col 2/lines 34-37, 57-col 3/lines 6);

where the chat client is in chat communication, e.g. conversation, with the two chat networks concurrently (simultaneous) over a period of time, displayed as a history of the conversation on the client chat (col 1/lines 5-39, col 2/line 20-24), the method comprising:

designating with the client, one of the two chat networks each having one server as an active chat network for receiving messages transmitted by the client, e.g. transmitting with the

chat client an instruction to a chat network having one server , e.g. a command which results appear in said chat communication received by the server and transmitted to recipients (col 6/lines 1-4, 25-37 and Fig. 2A, including commands generated, initiated or imparted with the client to the server on the one chat network to initiate a chat communication col 6/lines 38-65, including designating with the client, recipient(s) and respective servers, col 15/lines 20-27);

obtaining with the client, the messages which are transmitted to a first of the at least two chat networks having one or more server, and messages which are transmitted to a second of the at least two chat networks having one or more server (i.e. each client is associated with a *particular server*, which server is associated with a designated *client*, col 5/lines 3-11, designated as recipient by another col 13/lines 61-66), when a message is launched for initiating or joining a chat conversation, the launched message contains identification of the *intended recipients* (i.e. to which server is associated therewith), be used by network routers including *respective servers* to route the messages to the terminal(s) of the indicated addressees (col 15/lines 20-27); and

displaying, with the client, the obtained messages in a first discrete display area independent of a message display area of each of the plurality of chat networks which routed the message to respective recipients (Fig. 7, a message by the client to *initiate a chat*, where the *message* is sent from her *client* to a communications *server*, col 6/lines 38-45, the message is received by the server, the server send a corresponding message to the recipient for display, col 6/lines 65-col 7/line 53).

Hence, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made given the suggestions of Redpath for representing a data processing system for implementing a chat environment having a plurality of network each having their own set of resources including a plurality of processors comprising servers, the teachings for implementing a chat system as set forth by DeSimone would be readily apparent and well-known. One ordinary skilled in the art would be motivated to given Redpath suggestion of a variety of networks and network architectures to implement therein chat environments that do not limit users to participation in only one multi-party real-time chat communications concurrently over a period of time, but to allow multiple conversation over an elapsed time period using multiple windows, as suggested by DeSimone.

Regarding claim 2, the combined teachings of Redpath and DeSimone further teach

designation means (DeSimone client software: col 4/lines 11-38) designating at least one chat network of the plurality of chat network each comprising at least one server (110) (DeSimone col 1/lines 26-39) as an active chat network for receiving messages transmitted by a

user terminal (220 of Fig. 2A, col 2/lines 30-37, col 3/lines 50-col 4/line 3) (DeSimone: col 6/lines 1-4, 25-37 and Fig. 2A, including commands generated, initiated or imparted with the client to the server on the one chat network to initiate a chat communication col 6/lines 38-65, including designating with the client, recipient(s) and respective servers, col 15/lines 20-27);

message acquiring means (DeSimone client software: col 4/lines 11-38) of the user terminal running corresponding chat software for acquiring messages transmitted and received to each of the plurality of chat networks comprising one or more server (DeSimone: col 1/lines 48-59 and col 2/lines 48-49, i.e. sending and receiving all messages sent to each chat network col 1/lines 25-57, col 4/lines 4-18, client software acquiring means col 15/lines 50-53);

where the messages transmitted are requested by means (420 of Fig. 2) of the user terminal for display on the sender and receiver(s) display means (Redpath: column 4/lines 37-59);

message displaying means of the user terminal for displaying (e.g. a screen) (DeSimone col 1/lines 26-57, col 19/lines 11-12), wherein the acquired messages are displayed in a discrete display area independent of a message display area of each of the plurality of chat networks (DeSimone: Fig. 7, a message by the client to *initiate a chat*, where the *message* is sent from her *client* to a communications *server*, col 6/lines 38-45, the message is received by the server, the server send a corresponding message to the recipient for display, col 6/lines 65-col 7/line 53).

Regarding claim 3, message transmission cooperating means (220 of Fig. 2A) of the client for transmitting one of the messages when the message to be transmitted is displayed to one of the chat networks having one or more servers (210 of Fig. 2A) (DeSimone Figs. 4B, shows a message displayed to sent by Mike and a send button, col 1/lines 26-41, messages are sent to a server on the chat network col 4/lines 46-53, col 6/lines 38-45).

Claims 4-12 (Cancelled)

Claims 13-15 (Withdrawn)

Regarding claim 16, displaying comprises displaying messages of both chat networks in the discrete area independent of another area for displaying messages of one of the chat networks (DeSimone Fig. 7).

Regarding claim 17, wherein the discrete display area is separate from another display area that is dedicated to the active chat network (DeSimone Fig. 7)

Claims 18-25 (Withdrawn)

Regarding claims 26-27, DeSimone teaches wherein each independent chat network having one or more server comprises its own set of chat channels separate from the other chat network (Fig. 7), where a channel in the first chat network (conversation 1) and another channel in the second chat network (conversation 2) allowed to each have a same identifier (e.g. unique user identifier UID) for users to select from a list of recipients such channels but where such another channels do not share messages, e.g. the messages from Dawn in conversation 1 are not in conversation 2, as shown in Fig. 7.

Regarding claim 28, wherein chat networks different logical networks (DeSimone: col 1/lines 25-39 and 2/lines 1-3, col 5/lines 3-11).

Regarding claim 29, display area is a window for viewing chat conversations (DeSimone: col 4/line 39-56).

Regarding claims 30 and 35, extension of current well-known software methodologies and procedures (DeSimone: col 4/lines 19-37), i.e. executable software comprising instruction stored on a computer readable medium, that when executed perform the function associated with said software. This claim is the computer implementation of claim 1, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 31, these claims are substantially the same as claim 1, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 32, this claim is substantially the same as claim 29, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 33, this claim comprises limitation and/or features recited on claim 1, in that the information exchange transmits/receives messages sent concurrently over a period of time, i.e. “interspersedly transmitted”, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 34, inputting a selected instruction (i.e. designating) to a chat network for a channel communication to a chat recipient displayed in the discrete display area (Redpath: 616 on Fig. 6B, where the instruction is directed to at least one corresponding host server having an InetAddress and corresponding socket/port 5001, and DeSimone: Fig. 4B).

Regarding claim 36, comprises limitations substantially the same as those discussed on claims 1-2 and 31, same rationale of rejection is applicable, the method further comprising:

requesting and obtaining cooperation from the two chat networks for display of messages of the two chat networks, i.e. providing information requested through a display from the chat client for display of messages of at least one the chat network (DeSimone: column 6, line 39-67 and column 7, lines 17-53) to automatically extend a connection for the messages (Redpath, Fig. 5, steps 500, 520, 530 column 4, lines 9-16, transmission over connection of Fig. 5);

where the messages transmitted or received are requested by means (420 of Fig. 2) of the user terminal for display on the sender and receiver(s) display means (Redpath: column 4/lines 37-59);

obtaining with the client the messages of the two chat networks and displaying with the client the obtained messages in a first discrete display over a connection, i.e. where messages received by the chat client as the user inputs a message is displayed on the display means, thus the chat client automatically extends a connection to the display transmitted or received messages (Redpath column 4, lines 50-53).

Response to Arguments

10. Regarding claims 1, 2, and 31 as amended, it is argued that the prior art of record does not teach added limitation. Namely, “requesting and obtaining cooperation from the two chat networks for display of messages of the two chat networks”.

In response to the above-mentioned argument, applicant’s interpretation of the applied prior art has been considered. In this case, according to the invention’s disclosure it is a precondition that all the messages transmitted and/or received are notified to the message display while still being able to identify the cooperated IRC network and the channel. This is achieved by requesting to users to designate the IRC network and the channel by the cooperation request transmitting means which displays an image urging users to designate the cooperated IRC network name and the channel name, this obtained information is registered, namely the IRC network name and the channel name, thereafter, the message received means judges when the message is received, IRC network and channel to which the message is transmitted and notifies the message via the message notifying means for those considered as the cooperation object (see specs page 17, lines 5-29).

Thus, the invention’s disclosure does not seem to provide a written description where the cooperation request transmitting means *displays an image urging* users to designate the cooperated particularly “two IRC network names” and the channel name, obtaining and registering “two IRC network names” and the channel name, etc. It is not clear where in the written description is “cooperation requested and obtained from the two IRC networks”, namely where is a cooperation requested from the two IRC networks described in the invention’s disclosure.

[AS BEST UNDERSTOOD] the above described embodiment of the invention seems to describe where users are presented with an image by the chat system which urges the user to designate the IRC network name and the channel name, this obtained information is registered, thereafter, the message received from the designated IRC network and channel are notified to the display means. Broadest reasonable interpretation will be applied in accordance with the invention’s disclosure. Namely, claim limitation “requesting and obtaining cooperation from the two chat networks for display of messages of the two chat networks”, will be interpreted as providing information which was requested through a display from the chat client for display of messages of at least one the chat network.

DeSimone teaches providing information to the chat client for display of messages of at two chat networks. Figure 3, shows a window interface where the user (Dawn) is presented with an image by the chat system which urges the user to designate the participants of a chat room, the channel room name to initiate a chat room for displaying received and sent messages between designated participants

communicating on the designated chat room (column 6, line 39-67), thereafter messages to the chat room initiator (creator) and to all participants is sent (see column 7, lines 17-53). The initiator of the first chat conversation can originate a second chat conversation, where the initiator designated a distinct conversation identifier upon initiating a subsequent chat conversation, particularly, where messages for different chat conversation will be displayed on the chat client display separately and independent from the other. Figure 7 display (700) at the terminal for the user (chat client) displaying separate windows for displaying messages a chat communication between a first set of users, e.g. Mike, Dave and the creator Dawn where messages are displayed as chat conversation number one, initiated as discussed above and a second window (720) displaying a second chat communication between Tom, Dick and the creator Dawn where messages are displayed as chat conversation number two.

In this manner, DeSimone teaches where the chat system request the user to provide information, e.g. designate the channel name, for display of messages of at least one the chat network.

11. Regarding claim 36, it is argued (p. 8 of remarks) that the applied prior art does not teach newly added claim as presented. Namely, a display path for messages of the chat networks based on a request for cooperation.

In response to the above-mentioned argument, applicant's interpretation of the applied prior art has been fully considered. The claim clause, "to automatically extend a display path for messages" has been examined. The description of instant invention is a dictionary for the claims and should provide clear support or antecedent basis for all terms used in the claims. See 37 CFR 1.75, MPEP § 608.01(i), § 608.01(o), and § 1302.01. The claim or claims must conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification and the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description (See § 37 CFR 1.75 d(1)).

The specification has been reviewed with respect to the claimed term "display path" to ensure an adequate meaning in light of the specification is applied. Although the claimed term "display path" seems to lack antecedent basis in the specification, a path seems to relate to displaying the transmission and receipt of messages by a plurality of channels between the chat system and the message display means concurrently, by transmitting the contents of the message transmitted and/or received by the chat system to the display, concurrently. Specifically, when the display means is started, the cooperation display means (20) is started (shown as step S2101 of Fig. 3 illustrating cooperation request transmitting means process) to send (step S2101 of fig. 3) a command ("report message") is sent to the chat system, the process ends (step S2102 of Fig. 3). The request receiving means process of Fig. 4, illustrates, that when

the receiving means (31) determines that it is the cooperation request (step S3101 of Fig. 4), e.g. command report-message, the cooperation flag of setting information is validated (step S3102). Hence, a path for automatically transmitting the contents of the message transmitted and/or received by the chat system (30) is extended between the chat system and message display means (20) (see page 9, lines 5, line 5-34). The cooperation request transmitting means (21) transmits and/or received the setting information required for operating the chat system (30) and message display means (20) at the same time (specs page 7, lines 9-12)

Broadest reasonable interpretation will be applied in accordance with the invention's disclosure discussed above [AS BEST UNDERSTOOD]. Namely, claim limitation "automatically extend a display path for the messages", as meaning automatically transmitting over a connection the contents of the message transmitted and/or received by the chat system to the display means for displaying the messages.

Redpath teaches automatically transmitting over a connection "path" the contents of the message transmitted or received by the chat system to the display means for displaying the messages, specifically, where messages received by the chat client are automatically displayed by all other participants (Redpath, Fig. 5, steps 500, 520, 530 column 4, lines 9-16, transmission over connection of Fig. 5), and

where messages received by the chat client as the user inputs a message is displayed on the display means, thus the chat client automatically extends a connection "path" to the display (Redpath column 4, lines 50-53); and

where the messages transmitted or received are automatically requested by means (420 of Fig. 2) of the user terminal for display automatically on the sender and receiver(s) display means (Redpath: column 4/lines 37-59).

12. All Applicant's arguments as filed in the above-mentioned amendment have been fully considered but not found persuasive.

13. Reply to a final rejection or action must include cancellation of, or appeal from the rejection of, each rejected claim. If any claim stands allowed, the reply to a final rejection or action must comply with any requirements or objections as to form (see 1.113). If prosecution in an application is closed, an applicant may request continued examination of the application by filing a submission and the fee set forth in § 1.17(e) prior to the earliest of: (c) A submission as used in this section includes, but is not limited to, an information disclosure statement, an amendment to the written description, claims, or

drawings, new arguments, or new evidence in support of patentability. If reply to an Office action under 35 USC 132 is outstanding, the submission must meet the reply requirements of § 1.111 (see MPEP 706.07).

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prieto, B. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3902. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 5:30 to 2:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Andrew T. Caldwell can be reached at (571) 272-3868. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, status information for published application may be obtained from either Private or Public PAIR, for unpublished application Private PAIR only (see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov> or the Electronic Business Center at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand carried or delivered to:

Customer Service Window located at the Randolph Bldg.
401 Dulany St.
Alexandria, VA 22314

Faxed to the Central Fax Office:

(571) 273-8300 (New Central Fax No.)

Or Telephone:

(571) 272-2100 for TC 2100 Customer Service Office.

B. Prieto
Primary Examiner
TC 2100
September 12, 2006

Beatriz Prieto
BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER